

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for Ernst & Young

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>E&Y Supplemental Report</i>			
	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 25.	Section IV Item 7	<p>Please provide the status of the correction to SBC Ameritech processes and procedures that would prevent transactions from being recorded in the proper month.</p> <p>Please indicate the testing of the revised processes and procedures conducted by Ernst & Young.</p> <p>In the case site visits were made, indicate the locations and dates of the site visits.</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 26.	General	<p>Please provide E&Y's definition of the following terms, as used in its engagements involving compliance reviews of the SBC Ameritech business rules.</p> <p>Source System</p> <p>Reporting System</p> <p>Intermediate Applications</p> <p>Judgmental Selection (process)</p> <p>Raw Data</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>E&Y Supplemental Report</i>			
	Report Reference	Question	Response
		Critical Controls Significant Application	
AT&T/E&Y 27.	Page 3	<p>E&Y's report states: "For issues and PMs disclosed in Attachment B of the Report of Management where the Company's interpretation of the Business Rules did not appear to follow a literal reading of the Business Rules, E&Y compared the interpretation to the draft red-lined version of the business rules provided by the Company where the interpretation was planned to be submitted to the state commission for adoption."</p> <p>Please identify each of the "Interpretations" for which no business rule change (i.e., red-lined version of the business rules) was agreed between SBC Ameritech and the CLECs.</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for Ernst & Young

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>E&Y Supplemental Report</i>			
	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 28.	Page 3	<p>E&Y states its testing “[F]ocused on whether the underlying processes AIT utilized to collect and process data used in measuring its performance was accurate in all material respects in accordance with the Business Rules.”</p> <p>Please describe the methods employed by E&Y to evaluate the accuracy of the processes.</p> <p>Please explain the accuracy standard used by E&Y for this evaluation.</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 29.	Page 3	<p>E&Y reports that it employed “code reviews” to supplement its analysis of business rule compliance to identify additional error conditions.</p> <p>Please confirm that the results of such code reviews are contained in Attachment A to the Report of Management.</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 30.	Pages 4 and 5	Please provide the page and paragraph citations to the Illinois Master Test Plan Version 2 (May 2, 2002) that provide for developing process flows and activity dictionaries.	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for Ernst & Young

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>E&Y Supplemental Report</i>			
	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 31.	Page 5	Please explain the work function of the Company subject matter experts that E&Y interviewed in its activities involved in the corrective action reviews for revised processes.	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for Ernst & Young

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results

Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 32.	Pre-Ordering Exceptions	<p>For PMs 2, MI 10 and MI 16 where SBC Ameritech incorrectly excluded certain address verification transactions that were not able to be matched to living units or street addresses (23 Exceptions), please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p> <p>Please indicate the system that was used by the CLEC to place the queries.</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 33.	Pre-Ordering Exceptions	<p>For PMs 2, MI 10 and MI 16 where SBC Ameritech improperly counted LSOG 4 pre-order queries in the CSR and TN sub-measure results (11 Exceptions), what corrective action has SBC Ameritech undertaken?</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p> <p>Please identify the specific OSS, reporting process,</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		<p>or both that are affected by the corrective action.</p> <p>Please indicate the system that was used by the CLEC to place the queries.</p>	
AT&T/E&Y 34.	Pre-Ordering Exceptions	<p>For PMs 2, MI 10 and MI 16 where SBC Ameritech incorrectly excluded valid transactions, provide an explanation of the incorrect exclusions that caused the 2 Exceptions.</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p> <p>Please indicate the system that was used by the CLEC to place the queries.</p> <p>Please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 35.	Pre-Ordering Exceptions	<p>For PMs MI 10 and MI 16 where SBC Ameritech incorrectly excluded LSOG 1 transactions, provide an explanation of the incorrect exclusions that caused the 3 Exceptions.</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		<p>Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p> <p>Please indicate the system that was used by the CLEC to place the queries.</p> <p>Please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.</p>	
AT&T/E&Y 36.	Ordering	<p>E&Y reports that it selected transactions from MOR and LASR according to the transaction types listed on pages 2 and 3 of Appendix B.</p> <p>What methods were used by E&Y to identify MOR and LASR transaction types on the basis of transactions that devolve from LSRs?</p> <p>What method was used to identify the specific source system, i.e., MOR or LASR, for specific ordering transaction types?</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 37.	Ordering	<p>E&Y states that it selected “Service order sales transactions”. Please explain this transaction type more fully.</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 38.	Ordering Restatements	<p>“The percent of firm order confirmations (“FOCs”) returned was incorrectly calculated for the simple residence and business electronically processed submeasures during April and May 2002 as a result of utilizing the manual rather than the electronic benchmark for one interface to calculate the percentage of FOCs processed that were returned on time. This was due to the implementation of new systems and processes in the Ameritech region.”</p> <p>Please identify the “one interface” involved in this restatement.</p> <p>Please identify the specific OSS, interfaces, or other systems that are affected by the corrective action. Provide the implementation date(s), reasons, other than to effect this corrective action that the system(s) were implemented. Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p> <p>Please identify the specific process(es) that are affected by the corrective action. Provide the</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		implementation date(s), reasons, other than to effect this corrective action that the process(es) were implemented.	
AT&T/E&Y 39.	Ordering Restatements	<p>The SBC Assertion states: “Effective with June 2002 results reported in July 2002, new computer program code was implemented to utilize the electronic benchmark to calculate the percentage of FOCs processed that were returned on time rather than the manual benchmark.”</p> <p>Is the reference to “new” computer code and indication that an entire code module was introduced into the system? Or was existing code rewritten/revised?</p> <p>Please confirm that the “electronic” benchmark and the “manual benchmark” refer to the benchmarks provided in the PMs for electronically received and manually received orders, respectively.</p> <p>Identify the system where the program code was change/implemented. What was the date of implementation of the new code? Did E&Y confirm that the code was implemented? Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		<p>change(s).</p> <p>Please describe the evaluation methods employed by E&Y to confirm the implementation of the new code was made according to specifications.</p> <p>Describe the testing methodologies used by E&Y to confirm the compliance with the business rules for these PMs after implementation.</p>	
AT&T/E&Y 40.	Ordering Restatements	<p>For PMs 5 and 6, “An incorrect clock interval was being used to calculate FOC hours when the start time and end time span two business days.”</p> <p>SBC asserts: “Effective with October 2002 results reported in November 2002, the Company implemented new computer program coded to address this issue. April 2002 through September 2002 results were restated on December 5, 2002. A restatement for March 2002 is not required as LSOG 5 was not implemented until April 2002.”</p> <p>Identify the system where the program code was change/implemented. What was the date of implementation of the new code? Did E&Y confirm that the code was implemented? Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		<p>Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p> <p>Please describe the evaluation methods employed by E&Y to confirm the implementation of the new code was made according to specifications.</p> <p>Describe the testing methodologies used by E&Y to confirm the compliance with the business rules for these PMs after implementation.</p>	
AT&T/E&Y 41.	Ordering Restatements	<p>“For PM 6 only, results for electronically submitted simple residence and business local number portability (“LNP”) only requests were reported on a combined basis instead of disaggregated between electronic and manual processing as required by the Business Rules.”</p> <p>SBC asserts: “Effective with June 2002 results reported in July 2002, the Company reported separate levels of disaggregation for electronically submitted simple residence and business LNP only requests that were processed electronically and those that were processed manually. The months of March 2002 through May 2002 were restated on August 5, 2002.”</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		<p>Please explain what activities were undertaken by E&Y to validate the accuracy of the March 2002 through May 2002 restated results.</p> <p>What activities were undertaken to establish the integrity of the source data for the restated results.</p>	
AT&T/E&Y 42.	Ordering Restatements	<p>For PM 10: “LSOG 5 auto/ manual rejects were not reported during April and May 2002 due to the implementation of new systems and processes.”</p> <p>SBC asserts: “Effective with August 2002 results reported in September 2002, the Company changed the computer program code to include LSOG 5 auto/ manual rejects. April through July 2002 results were restated on September 5, 2002.”</p> <p>Please explain what “computer program code” was changed to include LSOG 5 auto/manual rejects. Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p> <p>What was the system of record that (i.e., the data retention systems from which the reporting program obtained the relevant data) for April through July 2002 results restated on September 5,</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		2002.	
AT&T/E&Y 43.	Ordering Restatements	<p>For PMs 13 and 13.1: “April and May 2002 affiliate results did not include certain records as a result of implementing new systems and processes (“LASR”).”</p> <p>SBC asserts: “Effective with July 2002 results reported in August 2002, the Company changed the computer program code to include the affiliate results for certain records and May and June 2002 results were restated in August 2002.”</p> <p>Please explain what “computer program code” was changed to include the affiliate results. Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p> <p>What was the system of record that (i.e., the data retention systems from which the reporting program obtained the relevant data) for May and June 2002 results restated in August, 2002.</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 44.	Ordering Exceptions	For PMs 5, 6, 7, 7.1, 8, 9, 10, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 11, 11.1, 11.2, 91, 93, 95, MI 2, MI 9	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		<p>“The Company excluded LNP with loop orders in which the loop portion of the order was rejected and then later corrected.</p> <p>SBC asserts: “For PMs 5, 6, 7, 7.1, 8, 9, 10, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 11, 11.1, 11.2, 95, and MI 2, effective with October 2002 results reported on November 20, 2002, the Company implemented new computer program code to include LNP with loop orders in which the loop portion of the order was rejected and then later corrected.”</p> <p>What system(s) was modified with the new computer code?</p> <p>What was the date of the code modification? Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p>	
AT&T/E&Y 45.	Ordering Exceptions	<p>For MI 13 “The Company was not using the correct end date/ time in one ordering system and was inaccurately capturing start times in another system. “</p> <p>SBC asserts: “Effective with September 2002 results reported in October 2002, new computer</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		<p>program code was designed and implemented to capture the correct start and end date/ time on line loss notifications. The months of June through August 2002 were restated on October 7, 2002. No restatement is planned for March, April, or May 2002 results for this issue.”</p> <p>Please explain why no restatements were planned for March, April or May 2002 results.</p>	
AT&T/E&Y 46.	Ordering Exceptions	<p>For PMs 7 and 8 where SBC Ameritech excluded service order confirmations [completions] (3 Exceptions) from these measures, provide an explanation of the types of orders, product types, and customer types that are involved in these discrepancies.</p> <p>Please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 47.	Ordering Exceptions	For PMs 7 and 8 where SBC Ameritech incorrectly included service order completions as timely (2 Exceptions) in these measures, provide an	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		<p>explanation of the types of orders, product types, and customer types that are involved in these discrepancies.</p> <p>Please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p>	
AT&T/E&Y 48.	Ordering Exceptions	<p>For PM 91 where SBC Ameritech incorrectly included LNP transactions that should have been excluded from this measures (5 Exceptions), provide an explanation of the types of orders, product types, and customer types that are involved in these discrepancies.</p> <p>Please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 49.	Ordering Exceptions	<p>For PM 93 where SBC Ameritech incorrectly excluded LNP transactions that should have been included in this measure (17 Exceptions), provide</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		included in this measure (17 Exceptions), provide an explanation of the types of orders, product types, and customer types that are involved in these discrepancies.	
AT&T/E&Y 50.	Ordering Exceptions	<p>For PM MI-12 where SBC Ameritech incorrectly excluded orders that should have been included in this measure (58 Exceptions), provide an explanation of the types of orders, product types, and customer types that are involved in these discrepancies.</p> <p>Please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 51.	Ordering Exceptions	<p>For PM MI-12 where SBC Ameritech incorrectly excluded retail transactions that should have been included in this measure (2 Exceptions), provide an explanation of the types of orders, product types, and customer types that are involved in these discrepancies.</p> <p>Please identify the specific OSS, reporting process,</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		or both that are affected by the corrective action. Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).	
AT&T/E&Y 52.	Ordering Exceptions	For the PM MI-12 Exceptions, please explain the term “field cycle date.”	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 53.	Ordering Exceptions	For the PM MI-12 Exceptions, please explain the system or process change that was implemented for the May data month that caused the incorrect exclusion of retail orders where the field cycle date was null. Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 54.	Ordering Exceptions	For PM MI-13 where SBC Ameritech did not provide the Line Loss Notifications (4 Exceptions), please identify the specific OSS that are affected by the corrective action. Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).	Answered during testimony. The ER that affected this change is ER1240, implemented with September 2002 results reported in October 2002.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 55.	Ordering Exceptions	<p>For PM MI-13 where SBC Ameritech did not capture the “final electronic processing time”, explain how and why this failure is related only to cases where the “winning CLEC originates the order through one ordering system and the Company sends the loss notification to the losing CLEC through a different ordering system.”</p> <p>Please identify the specific OSS that are affected by the corrective action.</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p>	<p>Answered during testimony.</p>
AT&T/E&Y 56.	Provisioning Exceptions	<p>Please indicate the number of retail provisioning transactions that were properly excluded from the test of the following PMs:</p> <p>43</p> <p>44</p> <p>45</p> <p>46</p>	<p>Answered during testimony.</p> <p>Revised Appendix B to be released.</p>

Docket No. 01-0662
 Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
 AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		47 48 49 50	
AT&T/E&Y 57.	Provisioning Exceptions	Please indicate the number of retail provisioning transactions that were properly excluded from the test of the following PMs: 55 55.1 55.2 55.3 56 56.1 58 59	Answered during testimony. Revised Appendix B to be released.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		60 61 62 63	
AT&T/E&Y 58.	Provisioning Exceptions	Please indicate the number of retail provisioning transactions that were properly excluded from the test of the following PMs: 98 99 100 101 WI 1 WI 9	Answered during testimony. Revised Appendix B to be released.
AT&T/E&Y 59.	Provisioning Exceptions	PMs 55, 55.1, 55.2, 55.3, and 56 all deal with UNE provisioning. Please explain the nature of the resale product (s) that were classified as “unknown” in the SBC Ameritech process of	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		<p>reporting UNE provisioning.</p> <p>What corrective action was E&Y advised SBC Ameritech would take to properly classify the resale products? Please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p>	
AT&T/E&Y 60.	Provisioning Exceptions	<p>For the PM 74 and 75 Exceptions, were discrepancies in exclusions for missed appointment codes observed for any cases other than projects in any of the months of March, April, or May?</p> <p>If yes, please explain those discrepancies.</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 61.	Provisioning Exceptions	For the PM 74 and 75 Exceptions, please explain the system or process change that was implemented for the May data month that caused projects to be excluded from reported results.	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 62.	Provisioning Exceptions	For PMs 74 and 75 Exceptions, please explain the discrepancy between the number of transactions reported in the Exception column and the Number	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		of Exceptions identified by E&Y.	
AT&T/E&Y 63.	Provisioning Exceptions	<p>For PMs 74 and 75 Exceptions, please explain the system or process change that was implemented to cause projects to be included in reported results.</p> <p>Please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 64.	Provisioning Exceptions	<p>For PM 31, please explain the reasons that a single transaction is “Properly Included” in the E&Y analysis of this measure.</p> <p>PM 31 “Average Delay Days For Missed Due Dates Due To Lack Of Facilities” excludes “Orders that are not N, T, or C.” and “No Field Work (NFW) Orders.”</p> <p>Is it E&Y’s position that all 1,081 CLEC service orders analyzed for this measure meet one or both of these exclusions?</p> <p>Please identify the source system data used to</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		develop the sample for testing this measure.	
AT&T/E&Y 65.	Provisioning Exceptions	<p>For PM 99, please explain the reasons that no transactions are “Properly Included” in the E&Y analysis of this measure.</p> <p>PM 99 ”Average Delay Days for Ameritech Missed Due Dates” excludes “On time or early completions.”</p> <p>Is it E&Y’s position that all 1,081 CLEC service orders analyzed for this measure were not completed early or on time?</p> <p>Please identify the source system data used to develop the sample for testing this measure.</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 66.	Maintenance and Repair Exceptions	<p>Explain the data records used for the E&Y transaction testing that was performed for PM 76 “Average Trunk Restoration Interval – Interconnection Trunks”</p> <p>Explain the information contained in each of the records used for these tests.</p> <p>Explain the source systems accessed for the records and the means employed by E&Y to obtain those</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		records for testing.	
AT&T/E&Y 67.	Maintenance and Repair Exceptions	<p>Explain the data records used for the E&Y transaction testing that was performed for PM MI-14 “Percent Completion Notifications Returned Within “X” hours of completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket.”</p> <p>Explain the information contained in each of the records used for these tests.</p> <p>Explain the source systems accessed for the records and the means employed by E&Y to obtain those records for testing.</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 68.	Maintenance and Repair Exceptions	<p>Explain the data records used for the E&Y transaction testing that was performed for PM WI-2 “Percent No Access (Percent of Trouble Reports with No Access) – UNE Loops.”</p> <p>Explain the information contained in each of the records used for these tests.</p> <p>Explain the source systems accessed for the records and the means employed by E&Y to obtain those records for testing.</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for Ernst & Young

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 69.	911 Exceptions	<p>Explain the testing methodology employed by E&Y to perform transaction testing of PM 102 “Average Time To Clear Errors” for Illinois.</p> <p>What data was reviewed?</p> <p>What analysis was done to determine that inclusions and exclusions were properly determined for each of the months of March, April, and May?</p> <p>Follow-up – Where do you get the start of the next cycle for the correction.</p>	<p>Original question answered during testimony</p> <p><i>Follow up response: Both the start and end time are populated by Intrado. The start time is the date and time the error was detected by Intrado during the process of updating the 911 database. The end time is the date and time that Intrado successfully updated the record. The number of days to clear errors is provided by Intrado on the TSS Report.</i></p>
AT&T/E&Y 70.	911 Exceptions	<p>Explain the testing methodology employed by E&Y to perform transaction testing of PM 103 “Percent Accuracy for 911 Database Updates” for Illinois.</p> <p>What data was reviewed?</p>	<p>Answered during testimony.</p>

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		What analysis was done to determine that inclusions and exclusions were properly determined for each of the months of March, April, and May?	
AT&T/E&Y 71.	911 Exceptions	<p>Explain the testing methodology employed by E&Y to perform transaction testing of PM 104 “Average Time Required to Update 911 Database (Facility Based Providers)” for Illinois.</p> <p>What data was reviewed?</p> <p>What analysis was done to determine that inclusions and exclusions were properly determined for each of the months of March, April, and May?</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 72.	911 Exceptions	<p>Explain the testing methodology employed by E&Y to perform transaction testing of PM 104.1 “The Average Time It Takes To Unlock the 911 Record)”</p> <p>What data was reviewed?</p> <p>What analysis was done to determine that inclusions and exclusions were properly determined for May?</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 73.	Poles, Conduit, and Right of Way Exceptions	For PMs 105, 106, and MI 5 where SBC Ameritech incorrectly calculated start and stop times, please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action. Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 74.	Poles, Conduit, and Right of Way Exceptions	For PMs 105, 106, and MI 5 where SBC Ameritech failed to maintain appropriate documentation, please identify the specific OSS, records maintenance process, reporting process, or other activities that are affected by the corrective action. Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 75.	Poles, Conduit, and Right of Way Exceptions	For PMs 105, 106, and MI 5 where SBC Ameritech reported certain transactions in the wrong month, please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action. Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for Ernst & Young

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		the change(s).	
AT&T/E&Y 76.	Directory Assistance Database Exceptions	Explain the process used by E&Y to select the five (5) days of May transactions that were tested.	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 77.	(Local Service Center (“LSC”), Local Operations Center (“LOC”) Automatic Call Distributor (“ACD”), i.e. Miscellaneous Administrative	<p>Explain the data records used for the E&Y transaction testing that was performed for PM 21.1 “Average Time Placed on Hold at LSC”</p> <p>Explain the information contained in each of the reports used for these tests.</p> <p>Explain the source systems accessed for the records and the means employed by E&Y to obtain those records for testing.</p> <p><i>Follow-up: What causes a queue to get populated, impact to disaggregation, where do specific products go in the queue?</i></p>	<p>Questions initially provided were answered during testimony.</p> <p><i>A queue gets populated/counted when the caller reaches the second tier of the call prompt. The disaggregations for this submeasure are UNE, DSL, and Resale. UNE measurements are calculated based upon ACD reports from 804 N. Milwaukee and Indianapolis. DSL measurements for this PM are calculated based upon ACD reports from Dallas. Resale measurements for this PM are calculated based upon ACD</i></p>

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
			<i>reports from Grand Rapids.</i>
AT&T/E&Y 78.	(Local Service Center (“LSC”), Local Operations Center (“LOC”) Automatic Call Distributor (“ACD”), i.e. Miscellaneous Administrative	<p>Explain the data records used for the E&Y transaction testing that was performed for PM 22 “Local Service Center (LSC) Grade Of Service (GOS)”</p> <p>Explain the information contained in each of the reports used for these tests.</p> <p>Explain the source systems accessed for the records and the means employed by E&Y to obtain those records for testing.</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 79.	(Local Service Center (“LSC”), Local Operations Center (“LOC”) Automatic Call Distributor	<p>Explain the error in SBC Ameritech reporting of retail results for PM 22.</p> <p>Please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p>	<p>Ameritech was improperly excluding billing and collections centers from the wholesale calculation for this measure. Results were restated for March 2002.</p> <p>Since this is a measure that is manually reported, the performance measurement manager that collects the data has added/ removed the appropriate call centers so that only the correct centers are included in</p>

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
	("ACD"), i.e. Miscellaneous Administrative		reporting data. ER 885 was implemented with April 2002 results reported in May 2002 to correct this issue.
AT&T/E&Y 80.	(Local Service Center ("LSC"), Local Operations Center ("LOC") Automatic Call Distributor ("ACD"), i.e. Miscellaneous Administrative	Explain the data records used for the E&Y transaction testing that was performed for PM 24.1 "Average Time Placed on Hold at LOC" Explain the information contained in each of the reports used for these tests. Explain the source systems accessed for the records and the means employed by E&Y to obtain those records for testing.	E&Y obtained the call data reports created by the Call Center Management Information System (CCMIS) by requesting it from SBC. This data is pulled by CCMIS directly from the switch, or the Automatic Call Distributor (ACD) that routes all calls to the LOC through the appropriate queue. The call data is summarized by queue and by day. Information provided includes the total calls answered, the total calls answered within 20 seconds, and the total number of seconds that calls were on hold on the specified day that were routed through the specified queue.
AT&T/E&Y 81.	(Local Service Center ("LSC"), Local Operations	Explain the data records used for the E&Y transaction testing that was performed for PM 25 "Local Operations Center (LOC) Grade Of Service (GOS)"	E&Y obtained the call data reports created by the Call Center Management Information System (CCMIS) by requesting it from SBC. This data is pulled by CCMIS directly from the switch, or the Automatic Call Distributor

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
	Center (“LOC”) Automatic Call Distributor (“ACD”), i.e. Miscellaneous Administrative	<p>Explain the information contained in each of the reports used for these tests.</p> <p>Explain the source systems accessed for the records and the means employed by E&Y to obtain those records for testing.</p>	<p>(ACD) that routes all calls to the LOC through the appropriate queue.</p> <p>The call data is summarized by queue and by day. Information provided includes the total calls answered, the total calls answered within 20 seconds, and the total number of seconds that calls were on hold on the specified day that were routed through the specified queue.</p>
AT&T/E&Y 82.	Coordinated Hot-Cuts (“CHC”) – Frame Due Time (“FDT”) or Coordinated Conversions	<p>Please explain the ways in which E&Y verified that the system changes implemented with the corrective actions for Item III 47 “incorrect start times for coordinated cuts” were properly implemented.</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p> <p>Please describe the steps taken by E&Y to review the correction(s).</p> <p>Provide the date(s) that E&Y reviewed the correction(s).</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 83.	Coordinated Hot-Cuts (“CHC”) – Frame Due Time (“FDT”) or Coordinated Conversions	<p>Please explain the ways in which E&Y verified that the corrective actions for Item III 48 “multiple order aggregations” were implemented.</p> <p>Please describe the steps taken by E&Y to review the correction(s).</p> <p>Provide the date(s) that E&Y reviewed the correction(s).</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 84.	Coordinated Hot-Cuts (“CHC”) – Frame Due Time (“FDT”) or Coordinated Conversions	Please provide E&Y’s analysis of the Properly Included, Properly Excluded, and Exceptions for PMs 114 and 115 according to the business rules and not according to SBC Ameritech’s procedures.	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 85.	OSS Interface Exceptions	<p>Explain the data records used for the E&Y transaction testing that was performed for PM 4 “OSS Interface Availability”</p> <p>Explain the information contained in each of the records used for these tests.</p> <p>Explain the source systems accessed for the records</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		and the means employed by E&Y to obtain those records for testing.	
AT&T/E&Y 86.	OSS Interface Exceptions	For the PM 4 testing, identify the thirteen (13) sub-measures that were evaluated for reporting of results in each of the months of March, April, and May.	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 87.	OSS Interface Exceptions	For PM MI 11 where SBC Ameritech incorrectly included notifications that should not have been reported, please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 88.	OSS Interface Exceptions	For PM MI 11 where SBC Ameritech incorrectly recorded start and end times, please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 89.	Change Management Exceptions	<p>Explain the data records used for the E&Y transaction testing that was performed for PM MI 15, “Change Management”.</p> <p>Explain the information contained in each of the records used for these tests.</p> <p>Explain the source systems accessed for the records</p>	Response not required by AT&T.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for Ernst & Young

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		and the means employed by E&Y to obtain those records for testing.	
AT&T/E&Y 90.	Change Management Exceptions	<p>For PM MI 15 where SBC Ameritech failed to correctly include all changes implemented as the denominator of this measure, please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.</p> <p>SBC asserts: “Effective with September 2002 results reported in October 2002, the Company implemented a process change to exclude exception letters. July 2002 results were restated on October 7, 2002; April and May results were restated on November 5, 2002.”</p> <p>What are the “exception letters”?</p> <p><i>Follow-up: cite appropriate use of accessible letters.</i></p>	<p>Questions initially provided were answered during testimony.</p> <p><i>PM MI 15 measures the timeliness of notification of the CLECs by the Company of changes (i.e. notifications regarding final business requirements) to interfaces maintained by the Company to support OSS connectivity with the CLECs. Changes to the final requirements made after notification of the CLECs but prior to release are communicated through accessible letters called exception letters (i.e. exceptions to final business requirements). If CLECs do not object to the change made to the final business requirements described in the exception letter, the exception letter is considered an "approved exception" letter. The business rules allow "approved exceptions" to be excluded from the results. The Company was not previously excluding "approved exception" letters as noted in Issue I - 52 but has since changed its process</i></p>

Docket No. 01-0662
 Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
 AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
			<i>to exclude these letters from results.</i>
AT&T/E&Y 91.	Billing Exceptions	<p>For E&Y’s PM 14 testing, explain the term “billing tables” as used to compare USOC rates for this test.</p> <p>Explain the source data for the billing tables.</p> <p>Explain the information contained in the billing tables that was used to conduct this test.</p> <p><i>Follow-up: What is the FOS Report?</i></p>	<p>Questions initially provided were answered during testimony.</p> <p><i>Future Optimum State (FOS) is the process that certifies the accuracy of AT&T CABS bills. Production Code Test (PCT) ensures the continued integrity of the CABS bills by testing a pre-determined set of conditions in the CABS system each month. The PCT is run on a monthly basis to compare test bills to expected amounts. Differences are compiled in a Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet called the FOS Report.</i></p>
AT&T/E&Y 92.	Billing Exceptions	Please confirm that the testing performed for PM 15 “... audited the bills in accordance with the Business Rules ...” means the Business Rules as interpreted by E&Y and not as interpreted by SBC Ameritech.	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 93.	Billing Exceptions	Please confirm that the testing performed for PM 15 “... proper handling of the bill audit results according to the Business Rules.” means the Business Rules as interpreted by E&Y and not as interpreted by SBC Ameritech.	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 94.	Billing Exceptions	Please confirm that the testing performed for PM 16 “... appropriately classified as to Ameritech or CLEC-caused error ... according to the Business Rules” means the Business Rules as interpreted by E&Y and not as interpreted by SBC Ameritech.	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 95.	Billing Exceptions	Please confirm that the testing performed for PM 16 “... the transmittal was appropriately included or excluded according to the Business Rules.” means the Business Rules as interpreted by E&Y and not as interpreted by SBC Ameritech.	Response not required by AT&T.
AT&T/E&Y 96.	Billing Exceptions	<p>Explain the data records used for the E&Y transaction testing that was performed for PM 19, “Daily Usage Feed Timeliness”.</p> <p>Explain the information contained in each of the records used for these tests.</p> <p>Explain the source systems accessed for the records and the means employed by E&Y to obtain those</p>	<p><i>E&Y obtained the monthly Unbundler and Reseller Stat Files from the mainframe that contain the following columns: State, Days Delay [number of days from data date (from EMI record) to the Cycle Date (day usage data is sent to CLEC)], Number of Messages (usage files), ACNA, and Company Name.</i></p> <p><i>The Unbundler and Reseller Stat Files were</i></p>

Docket No. 01-0662
 Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
 AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		records for testing.	<p><i>combined in Microsoft Excel by month (March, April, May 2002)</i></p> <p><i>All messages (usage files) that were sent to the CLEC were totaled to achieve the denominator.</i></p> <p><i>All messages (usage files) with a Days Delay of greater than 6 days were sorted and totaled to achieve the numerator (total usage records within 6 days minus usage records greater than 6 days) according to the business rules.</i></p> <p><i>To determine that the reported PM results as obtained from the CLEC website were accurate, we agreed the results in the AIT region to the results calculated by E&Y, noting no exceptions. Our results were obtained by applying the appropriate levels of disaggregations per the Business Rules to the entire population obtained for our testing.</i></p> <p><i>To ensure that the column Days Delay (utilized to calculate numerator) in the Unbundler and Reseller Stat Files from the</i></p>

Docket No. 01-0662
 Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
 AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
			<i>Mainframe was functioning according to the business rules, a code review was performed on the logic utilized to generate the report. The review noted no exceptions and that the Days Delay column (duration) is functioning as stated in the business rules (i.e. measuring the duration between the date the usage is recorded until the date the usage is sent to the CLECs).</i>
AT&T/E&Y 97.	Billing Exceptions	<p>Explain E&Y’s term in Note 11 citing an example of an alternative testing procedure it employed -- “a detailed code review”.</p> <p>Explain what was reviewed and the standard applied for the review.</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 98.	Billing Exceptions	<p>Please confirm that the Exceptions E&Y refers to in Note 11 are those that state:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Retail data was included in the wholesale results in error during the Evaluation Period due to the counting of certain win back service orders entered by wholesale service representatives as wholesale</p>	Response not required by AT&T.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		<p>results.”</p> <p>“During the Evaluation Period, the Company did not include prior months’ carrier unbillable dollars in the numerator of PM 20 and also excluded certain carrier messages that were not considered to be “unbillable” usage by the Company. Effective with July reporting, the Company included all current carrier unbillable usage in the numerator.”</p> <p>Identify any other references to SBC Ameritech billing measure defects.</p>	
AT&T/E&Y 99.	Billing Exceptions	<p>For PM 17 where SBC Ameritech incorrectly included retail data in the wholesale results, please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 100	Billing Exceptions	For PM 20 where SBC Ameritech failed to include prior month's carrier unbillable dollars in the numerator, please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action. Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).	Response not required by AT&T.
AT&T/E&Y 101	Billing Exceptions	For PM 20 where SBC Ameritech incorrectly excluded carrier messages, please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action. Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).	Response not required by AT&T.
AT&T/E&Y 102	Facilities Modification Exceptions	For PMs CLEC WI 6, CLEC WI 7 and CLEC WI 8 where SBC Ameritech incorrectly excluded transactions (8 Exceptions), provide an explanation of the types of orders, product types, and customer types that are involved in these discrepancies. Explain what corrective action has SBC Ameritech undertaken. Please identify the specific OSS,	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		<p>reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p> <p>Identify the data months involved in each of the Exceptions.</p>	
AT&T/E&Y 103	Facilities Modification Exceptions	<p>For PM CLEC WI 9 where SBC Ameritech incorrectly excluded cancelled orders (4 Exceptions), provide an explanation of the types of orders, product types, and customer types that are involved in these discrepancies.</p> <p>Explain what corrective action has SBC Ameritech undertaken. Please identify the specific OSS, reporting process, or both that are affected by the corrective action.</p> <p>Please provide the Enhancement Request or Change Request number that was prepared to effect the change(s).</p> <p>Identify the data months involved in each of the Exceptions.</p>	Response not required by AT&T.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 104.	Site Visits	For each of the site visits conducted by E&Y, indicate the date(s) each site was visited by E&Y for the purpose of documenting the manual processes and procedures utilized at the site.	Please refer to Attachment 1.
AT&T/E&Y 105.	Site Visits	For each of the site visits conducted by E&Y, indicate the date(s) each site was visited by E&Y for the purpose of documenting the controls over the manual processes and procedures utilized at the site.	Please refer to Attachment 1.
AT&T/E&Y 106.	Site Visits	For each of the site visits conducted by E&Y, identify the names and titles of the SBC Ameritech staff that accompanied or escorted E&Y to the site.	Please refer to Attachment 1.
AT&T/E&Y 107.	Site Visits	For each of the site visits conducted by E&Y, identify the names and titles of the SBC Ameritech staff that provided subject matter expertise to E&Y at the site.	Please refer to Attachment 1.
AT&T/E&Y 108.	Site Visits	Provide the titles, versions, and publication dates of the operational documentation	Please refer to Attachment 2.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		provided by SBC Ameritech including education and training policies and procedures, quality assurance policies and procedures, and employee hiring and review processes and procedures.	

<i>Attachment A – Exceptions to Compliance</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 109.	Performance Measure Code Review	<p>Please explain the change control methodology E&Y observed for the changes to programming code that were made by SBC Ameritech.</p> <p>Provide copies of change request documentation that E&Y observed in its reviews of the programming code propriety.</p> <p>Provide copies of change request documentation that E&Y observed in its reviews to ensure processes and controls were modified to support code changes.</p>	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Attachment A – Exceptions to Compliance</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 110.	Performance Measure Code Review	Confirm that any errors noted in this testing are provided in Attachment A only where those errors meet or exceed the E&Y materiality standard describe in its Attestation Report at Section I. If this is not the case, please provide an explanation of the error reporting.	Exceptions identified through review of the program code are identified in Attachment A to our compliance report.
AT&T/E&Y 111.	Transaction Testing	Confirm that any errors noted in this testing are provided in Attachment A only where those errors meet or exceed the E&Y materiality standard describe in its Attestation Report at Section I. If this is not the case, please provide an explanation of the error reporting.	Yes, exceptions detected through transaction testing are included in Attachment A to our compliance report unless it could be determined that the error had less than a 5% impact on the reported result.
AT&T/E&Y 112.	Transaction Testing – Sampling Approach	Explain the reasons for establishing samples of 260 transactions for those transactions where the population exceeds 5,000.	Please see supplemental report, page 7 regarding Transaction Testing – Statistical Sampling Approach.
AT&T/E&Y 113.	Transaction Testing – Sampling Approach	Explain the reasons for establishing samples of 40 transactions for those transactions where the population is less than or equal to 5,000.	Please see supplemental report, page 7 regarding Transaction Testing – Statistical Sampling Approach.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Attachment A – Exceptions to Compliance</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 114.	Performance Measure Recalculations	<p>Confirm that any errors noted in this testing are provided in Attachment A only where those errors meet or exceed the E&Y materiality standard described in its Supplemental Report at footnote 3.</p> <p>If this is not the case, please provide an explanation of the error reporting.</p>	Yes, exceptions detected through recalculations are included in Attachment A to our compliance report unless it could be determined that the error had less than a 5% impact on the reported result.
AT&T/E&Y 115.	Restatement Testing	Please identify the periods of time for which E&Y conducted its review of SBC Ameritech's processes and procedures for making restatements and communicating results.	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 116.	Restatement Testing	<p>Did E&Y observe any occasions where SBC Ameritech communicated a planned restatement, but failed to provide such a restatement according to the notice to external parties?</p> <p>If yes, please provide details of each such incident.</p>	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 117.	Restatement Testing	Did E&Y observe any occasions where SBC Ameritech failed to communicate a restatement to external parties prior to	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Attachment A – Exceptions to Compliance</i>			
Question No.	Report Reference	Question	Response
		effecting the restatement? If yes, please provide details of each such incident.	
AT&T/E&Y 118.	Restatement Testing	Confirm that any errors noted in this testing are provided in Attachment A only where those errors meet or exceed the E&Y materiality standard describe in its Attestation Report at Section I. If this is not the case, please provide an explanation of the error reporting.	Yes, this statement is correct.

<i>Attachment B -- Interpretations</i>			
	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 119.		Please identify the date E&Y advised SBC Ameritech of Interpretation 24.	Answered during testimony.
AT&T/E&Y 120.		Please identify the date E&Y advised SBC Ameritech of Interpretation 29.	Answered during testimony.

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Attachment B -- Interpretations</i>			
	Report Reference	Question	Response
AT&T/E&Y 121.		<p>Please identify the exclusions that SBC Ameritech applies for PMs 110 and 111.</p> <p>Please confirm that the Business Rules provide for exclusions of weekends and holidays.</p>	<p><i>The exclusions applied by the Company for PMs 110 and 111 are:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1) Weekends</i> <i>2) Updates rejected due to incorrect/invalid data from a facility-based CLEC (e.g missing a zip code, incomplete phone number, etc)</i> <p><i>The Business Rules for PMs 110 and 111 provide for exclusions of weekends and holidays as well as updates rejected due to incorrect/invalid data from a facility-based CLEC.</i></p>
AT&T/E&Y 122.		<p>Please identify the exclusions that SBC Ameritech applies for PM 113.</p> <p>Please confirm that the Business Rules do not provide for exclusions of weekends and holidays.</p>	<p><i>The exclusions applied by the Company for PM 113 are:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1) Weekends</i> <i>2) Updates rejected due to incorrect/invalid data from a facility-based CLEC (e.g. missing a zip code, incomplete phone number, etc.)</i>

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for Ernst & Young

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

<i>Attachment B -- Interpretations</i>			
	Report Reference	Question	Response
			<p><i>The Business Rules do not explicitly state that there is an exclusion of weekends and holidays.</i></p> <p><i>The system in question runs only on a 5-day cycle (i.e. orders are accepted Monday through Friday). As this PM measures whether or not a transaction flowed through the update process without manual intervention, the inclusion of Weekends or Holidays does not impact results and thus is not considered an exception or an interpretation.</i></p>

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

Attachment 1 (AT&T/EY 104-107)

Location	Description	PMs Impacted	Activities	Date of Visit	Main Contact/Escort	Contacts Interviewed (SMEs)
Hoffman Estates, IL	Performance Measurement Reporting Group	All		July 24, 2002	Director, Performance Measure Change Management	Director, Performance Measure Change Management
Pewaukee, WI	Retail Small Business Center (Non-complex products) - Consumer Service Bureau	Ordering & Provisioning	Retail business non-complex orders	July 31, 2002	Field Operations Manager	Customer Service Bureau Representative
Detroit, MI	Retail Mid to Large Business Center (Complex products)	Ordering & Provisioning	Retail business complex orders	July 24, 2002	Field Operations Manager	Customer Service Bureau Representative
Southfield, MI	Retail and Wholesale Maintenance & Installation Center	Provisioning	Dispatch and monitor wholesale and retail orders and trouble tickets	July 25, 2002	Director	Customer Care Center Representative
Saginaw, MI	Retail and Wholesale Billing Operations Center	Billing		August 6-7, 2002	Senior Team Manager; Billing Operations Supervisor	Resale Bill Validators; Message Error Correction Manager
Milwaukee	Wholesale -	Ordering &	UNE-P ordering;	July 15-16,	Area Manager Regulatory	Local Service Center

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

, WI	Local Service Center (LSC) - UNE-P	FMOD	FMOD entries for conditioning	2002	Relations	Representatives (3)
Grand Rapids, MI	Wholesale - LSC - Resale & Centrex	Ordering	Resale & Centrex ordering	July 22-23, 2002	Area Manager Regulatory Relations	Local Service Center Representatives (3)
Milwaukee, WI	Wholesale - Local Operations Center	Maintenance & CHC/FDT	Receipt of trouble tickets; coordination of CHC with CLEC & CO	July 15-16, 2002	Project Manager LOC	LOC Representative
Brecksville, OH	Wholesale - Code Assurance Group	NXX	Load and test NPA and NXX codes	August 26-27, 2002	Manager	Network Provisioning Manager
Marquette, MI	Wholesale Coordination Center	Provisioning & Maintenance	Close wholesale UNE orders and trouble tickets; jep all wholesale orders	August 7, 2002	Manager	Maintenance Administrator
Richardson, TX	Wholesale Collocation Service Center	Collocation	Receive and process collocation applications	August 8, 2002	Area Manager Collocation Service Center	CSC Representative
Chicago, IL	Listing Services Department	DA Database	Receive and process manual update orders for the Directory Assistance Database	August 16, 2002	Manager	CLEC Analyst Team Leader; Listing Services Associate
Milwaukee, WI	Resale Billing System	Billing		August 19-21, 2002	Project Manager; Manager	Billing Performance Measures Manager; FOS Reporting Manager

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

Milwaukee, WI	LSC - Billing	Billing		August 19-21, 2002	Project Manager; Manager	Billing Performance Measures Manager
Southfield, MI	Wholesale LSC - UNE-P	Ordering	UNE-P ordering	August 29, 2002	Manager	Local Service Center Representatives (3)
St. Louis, MO	Performance Measure Reporting group - DSS	Order, Pre-order, Provisioning	Calculate performance measures and apply business rules in DSS	September 5, 2002	Senior Database Administrator	Database Administrator
Indianapolis, IN	RRS database administrators	Provisioning & Maintenance	Receive and load source system files containing PM data	September 4, 2002	Senior Database Administrator	Database Administrator
Arlington Heights, IL	Retail Residence - Consumer Call Center (CCC)	Ordering & Provisioning	Retail residence orders	December 11, 2002	General Manager	Coach Leader; Process Manager; Customer Care Center Representatives (2)
Cicero, IL	Retail and Wholesale - Central Office (CO)	Provisioning & CHC/FDT	Close out all DI orders and tickets; close out FDT orders	December 6, 2002	CO Manager; Wholesale Compliance Manager	CO Manager
Chicago, IL	Wholesale - Trunk Provisioning Center (TPC)	Provisioning	Close trunk service orders	December 12, 2002	Area Manager	TPC Technician
Chicago, IL	Wholesale - Centralized Translations Group (CTG)	Maintenance & NXX	Close trunk trouble tickets	December 12, 2002	Area Manager	CTG Technician
Cicero, IL	Wholesale Administration Center	Provisioning & Maintenance	Close wholesale POTS and UNE-P orders and trouble	December 6, 2002	Wholesale Manager	Maintenance Administrator

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

	Center	Maintenance	orders and trouble tickets; manually close out orders in ASON			
Schaumburg, IL	Technician Ride Alongs	Provisioning & Maintenance	Close retail orders and trouble tickets; wholesale orders and trouble tickets are called in to WCC or Admin Center by technicians	December 10, 2002	Field Manager; Wholesale Compliance Manager	Customer System Technician
Oak Brook, IL	Retail Residence - Consumer Call Center (CCC)	Ordering & Provisioning	Retail residence orders	January 22, 2003	General Manager	Customer Service Representatives (2)

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

Attachment 2 (AT&T/EY 108)

Title	Document	Publication Date	Version/ Revision Date
Jeopardy Code		7/1/2002	N/A
SBC Ameritech Performance Appraisal Form		N/A	N/A
Ameritech User Resource Services		9/28/2000	N/A
Ameritech Billing Operations Support		9/1/2000	N/A
Ameritech Services Inc. Ameritech Long Distance Industry Services		N/A	March 13, 2000
Ameritech Technician Handbook	AM-UG-CSI-000040	5/10/2002	N/A
SSTC: Special Services Provisioning & Operations Procedures (SSPOP)	002-216-146	4/1/2002	N/A
Priorities & Distribute Technician Work		4/1/1998	N/A
SBC Trouble Type Codes Loop Maintenance and Operations System	660-169-015	1/5/2002	N/A
WCC & Admin Center Task Summary		N/A	N/A
WCC UNE MA Checklist		N/A	N/A
Unbundled Network Element (UNE) Service Order Handling For I&R Student Guide		1/1/2002	N/A
Quality Observation Form - LOC		N/A	N/A
Trouble Entry/Trouble Report (TE/TR) instructions		N/A	N/A
Curriculum for UNE - LSC		N/A	N/A
Curriculum for Resale - LSC		N/A	N/A
FMOD process		N/A	N/A
Curriculum for UNE linshare - LSC		N/A	N/A
MetPro - LSC General Processing		N/A	N/A
MetPro - MORTel User Guide		N/A	N/A
MetPro - Notifications 13 States		N/A	April 12, 2002
MetPro - Overview of 271		N/A	N/A
MetPro - PreOrder		N/A	May 21, 2002
MetPro - Resale Basic Ordering Procedures		N/A	March 7, 2002
MetPro - RightFAX Faxing Solution for AIT Unbundling		11/1/2000	N/A
MetPro - RightFAX Faxing Solution for Resale		8/15/2002	N/A
Coordinated Hot Cuts/TBCC/Hot Cut Tickets	002-341-025	4/23/2001	N/A
Unbundled Network Element (UNE) Service Order Handling For CO Technician		6/1/2002	N/A

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

Data Summary Documentation for PM's 24.1 and 25, 4/24/02		4/24/2002	N/A
AIT PM 114.1_BTR_Technical Documentation_HICKS_6_27_02		6/27/2002	N/A
AIT PM 114_114.1_115_115.1_115.2_MI3_BTR_TaskMate_04_23_02		4/23/2002	N/A
AIT PM 114_BTR_Technical Documentation_HICKS_6_27_02		6/27/2002	N/A
AIT PM 115.1_BTR_Technical Documentation_HICKS_6_27_02		6/27/2002	N/A
AIT PM 115.2_BTR_Technical Documentation_HICKS_6_27_02		6/27/2002	N/A
AIT PM 115_BTR_Technical Documentation_HICKS_6_27_02		6/27/2002	N/A
AIT PM MI 3_BTR_Technical Documentation_HICKS_6_27_02		6/27/2002	N/A
AIT PM 117_118_BTR_processing instrc_05_01_02		5/1/2002	N/A
AIT PM 119_BTR_processing instrc_04_17_02		4/17/2002	N/A
Process CLO and CLR Jeopardy Reports Performance Support		11/1/2002	N/A
WFA Jep List Report Performance Support		5/1/1998	N/A
Close No Access Report Performance System		9/1/1997	N/A
RFC Jeopardy Report Performance System		5/1/1998	N/A
RMR Jeopardy Report Performance System		1/1/1998	N/A
Process INET Jeopardy Performance System		6/2/2002	N/A
Process HLD Jeopard Report		8/1/1999	N/A
Process DFC Jeopardy Performance Support System		3/29/2002	N/A
Monitor TSA Hold Jeopardy		12/1/1998	N/A
Process NAO Jeopardy		2/1/1999	N/A
Process WFA JEP		7/1/1999	N/A
Process WFA JEP (Additional)		9/1/1999	N/A
Building Multiples		10/11/2002	N/A
Closing Trouble Reports in WFA		10/11/2002	N/A
Construction and IM Openers		N/A	N/A
Customer Cancels Ticket		10/11/2002	N/A
Customer Statusing-Mtce		N/A	N/A
Defective Service Orders		N/A	N/A
DODLB		10/11/2002	N/A
DOLPRM		10/11/2002	N/A
DOLST		10/11/2002	N/A
DOLST Input		10/11/2002	N/A
WFADO: Work List Output		10/11/2002	N/A
DOPAD		10/11/2002	N/A
DOSUPV		10/11/2002	N/A

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for *Ernst & Young*

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

DOTEC		10/11/2002	N/A
DOTEC Verbage		10/11/2002	N/A
DPRO Job Aid		10/11/2002	N/A
GMAIL		10/11/2002	N/A
Helping		1/24/2002	N/A
INET Testing Using WFA		10/11/2002	N/A
Keeping Work in Front of the Techs		10/11/2002	N/A
Maintenance PM Survival Guide		N/A	N/A
Loaning Between Control Groups		3/15/2002	N/A
MC Task Assignment List		N/A	N/A
WFA ICC Morning Controller Guide		10/11/2002	N/A
WFA MC Morning Controller Guide		10/11/2002	N/A
Prevent No Jobs Available		10/11/2002	N/A
Pulling an OQS Report		N/A	N/A
Preassign Jobs		10/11/2002	N/A
Process for Installation and Maintenance Closeouts		10/11/2002	N/A
RBOR When and Why		10/11/2002	N/A
Returning Jobs		10/11/2002	N/A
Technician Dispatch Verification		N/A	N/A
Testing for DOLST		10/11/2002	N/A
Vendor Meet Job Aid for the Operation Center		N/A	N/A
WFA Job Aids Table of Contents		10/11/2002	N/A
LSR General Processing - 13 States		4/1/2002	June 1, 2002
End User Return Facility Based UNE Products and Resale - FLUP Positions		N/A	N/A
New Loops, DSL, ISDN, and Disconnects Checklist	LOC JA-17A	4/27/2000	April 29, 2002
Past Due Order Functions	LOC JA-17C	4/27/2001	November 28, 2001
Coordinated Hot Cut (CHC) Checklist	LOC JA-66	11/14/2000	June 26, 2002
IDSL Checklist	LOC JA-17B	7/10/2002	N/A
ATLAS Quarterly Review Checklist		N/A	N/A
ATLAS Report Selection by Rep		N/A	N/A
CLEC 13-State Interface Change Management Process		11/30/2001	Version 1.3
Accessible Letter Guidelines		12/1/2001	February 22, 2002
Centralized Translation Group - Calling the Customer		9/2/1998	N/A

Docket No. 01-0662
Illinois Commerce Commission OSS Test Collaborative Meetings
AT&T Advanced Questions for Ernst & Young

Workshop Exhibit 2.0

Centralized Translation Group - Trouble Tickets		N/A	March 15, 2002
Unbundled Order Provisioning for the CO Technician - FDT/CHC/SPLC4 Process Student Guide	NH131	6/1/2001	N/A
Vantive Downtime Procedures		N/A	N/A
Vantive Downtime Recording of Priority 1 Outages - M&Ps		N/A	June 25, 2001